REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim 1 is pending in the present application. Claim 1 was amended and claim 41 was added. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tuli, U.S. Patent No. 6,941,382 B1 (hereinafter Tuli_A) in view of Tuli, U.S. Publication No. 2001/0028470 A1 (hereinafter Tuli_B) further in view of Robotham et al., U.S. Publication No. 2002/0015042 A1 (hereinafter Robotham). Office Action dated November 14, 2008, pp. 3-6. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The following limitation was added to claim 1:

> dividing the web page bitmap image into a plurality of web page bitmap image fragments including a first web page bitmap image fragment and a second web page bitmap image fragment by dividing a web page x-axis dimension by an x-axis dimension of the display screen to obtain a first quotient having a first quotient remainder, dividing a web page y-axis dimension by a y-axis dimension of the display screen to obtain a second quotient having a second quotient remainder, rounding up the first quotient remainder to a first nearest whole number, and rounding up the second quotient remainder to a second nearest whole number so that each web page image fragment is displayed at an intended resolution of the web page.

Support for the limitation is found in the specification, page 10, line 16 to page 11, line 8. The prior art of record is silent as to addressing division of x-axis and y axis dimensions including rounding up of remainders so that each web page image fragment is displayed at an intended resolution of the web page. Tuli A, col. 2, lines 56-59 states that "[t]he information is decompressed and displayed in the order of priority *such that part of image 7*, which substantially or completely covers the displayable areas 13 (FIG. 2), of the palm device ..." (emphasis added). Thus, only part of Tuli A's image is displayed on the display window of the hand held device.

Claim 1 was further modify and add to the following limitation:

wherein the proxy creates a first unique identifier for the first web page bitmap image fragment that identifies the user with the first web page bitmap image fragment and that is a first time, to a first nanosecond, that the user requested the first web page bitmap image fragment; and

wherein the proxy creates a second unique identifier for the second web page bitmap image fragment that identifies the user with the second web page bitmap image fragment and that is a second time, to a second nanosecond, that the user requested the second web page bitmap image fragment.

Support for the limitation is found in the specification, page 14, lines 17-21. Robotham, [0216] to [0218] discloses transmission of "a timestamp (previously supplied by the server) for its cached selection region 124 when requesting a refresh." The timestamp is used in conjunction with computation of pixel differences between a "newly rendered selection" and "its corresponding time-stamped cached bitmap representation" so that "[i]f a difference representation for the selection region can be encoded more compactly than the complete pixels of the selection region, this difference representation can be transmitted to the client 24 along with an updated time-stamp." Amended claim 1 recites that the identifier *is* the time to a nanosecond that the user requested the web page bitmap image fragment. Neither Robotham, Tuli A, or Tuli B, individually or in combination, disclose use of a time to a nanosecond that the user requested a web page bitmap fragment to identify the web page bitmap fragment with the user.

New claim 42 recites the following:

The computer-implemented method of claim 1 further comprising responsive to the web page having a hyperlink to a linked web page, creating a first hyperlink segment image on the first web page bitmap image fragment and a second hyperlink segment image on the second web page bitmap image fragment;

responsive to displaying the first web page bitmap image fragment on the display screen, and responsive to a user moving a cursor over the first hyperlink segment image, instructing a browser to go to the linked web page; and

responsive to displaying the second web page bitmap image fragment on the display screen, and responsive to the user moving the cursor over the second hyperlink segment image, instructing the browser to go to the linked web page.

Support for new claim 42 is found in the specification, page 9, line 15-page 10, line 15. In particular, in regard to the cursor, see page 9, line 23-page 10, line 1. A segmented image of the hyperlink is displayed and passage of a cursor over the segmented image causes the browser to

go to the linked web page. The prior art of record in the application, individually or in combination is silent as to this limitation.

Therefore, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been overcome.

II. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the cited art and is now in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: February 12, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

/Rudolf O. Siegesmund/

Rudolf O. Siegesmund
Reg. No. 37,720
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Attorney for Applicants